

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 15, and 21 through 25 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the final Office Action of April 4, 2005.

**Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant notes the filing of a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement herein on February 22, 2005 and note that a copy of the PTO-1449 was not returned with the outstanding Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests that the information cited on the PTO-1449 be made of record herein.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,453,127) in view of Roosen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0036793)

Claims 1 through 15, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,453,127) (“Wood”) in view of Roosen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0036793) (“Roosen”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant asserts that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant’s disclosure.

Claim 1 is directed to “[a] method of customizing a printer control panel, said method comprising: initiating a remote request by a web browser over a network for a web page from a web server incorporated in a printing device and linked to said network, said web page associated with at least one software application, said at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality for controlling operations of said printing device; transmitting said web page over said network; downloading and displaying said web page using said web browser; downloading said at least one software

application using said web browser in response to downloading said web page, and customizing a printer control panel using said at least one software application.”

Regarding independent claim 1, the Applicant asserts that Wood in view of Roosen does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention. The Office Action reiterates the same grounds for rejection as in the Office Action mailed December 3, 2004. The office Action asserts that Wood teaches “customizing a printer control panel.” Wood essentially teaches being able to customize a print job from a remote workstation or computer attached to a printer in much the same way a print job can be manipulated at a printer LCD screen. Some of the options described in Wood are: “sides to be imaged, collate selections, paper supply options, image quality (darken-lighten) selections, reduction/enlargement selections, finisher selections, [and] quantity requested.” Column 3, lines 55 through 58. These are the types of options common to printer controls. Wood does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of independent claim 1 calling for “customizing a printer control panel.” Wood explains that “[t]o the operator at the remote terminal, the interface with the copier/printer . . . appears similar to that of an operator control/panel of a conventional copier/printer.” Column 6, lines 31 through 34.

Drawing FIG. 3 of the Applicant’s disclosure illustrates one approach for “customizing a control panel.” “[S]elected features are compiled in a ‘selected feature window’ 114 as ‘selected labeled feature buttons’ 113 for incorporation into a user-configured and usable version of a customized or customizable printer control panel 100.” Paragraph [0059]. “Selected labeled feature buttons 113 may also be arranged in location (e.g., by clicking and dragging) and manipulated in a desired presentation style.” Paragraph [0060]. Furthermore, the present invention contemplates an option wherein related features can be “layered” in a hierarchical and customized fashion.” Paragraph [0061]. By way of example only, selection of features to be included in a printer control panel may occur by “activation of on/off selectors (e.g., “checking” a box associated with a labeled feature button 112, “pressing” or “highlighting” a labeled feature button 112 to select or deselect a particular feature, “double-clicking” on a labeled feature button 112, etc.), selection of features and feature options from a drop-down menu or other menu type, and use of “click and drag” techniques.” Paragraph [0058].

Wood does not teach or suggest such a claim limitation for “customizing a printer control panel.” Roosen does not cure that deficiency. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of non-obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention of independent claim 1 has not been established.

Claims 2 through 14 are non-obvious for at least the reason of depending from a non-obvious base claim.

Claim 15 is directed to “[a] system for customizing a printer control panel, comprising: a printing device incorporating a web server, said web server linked to a network, at least one workstation configured for communicating with said network, said at least one workstation having a web browser thereon; and at least one software application transmissible by said web server and accessible by said web browser, said at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality for said printing device through user input on said at least one workstation.”

Regarding claim 15, the Applicant asserts that Wood in view of Roosen does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15. Again, the Office Action reiterates the same grounds for rejection as in the Office Action mailed December 3, 2004. The Office Action asserts that Wood teaches “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” Wood essentially teaches being able to customize a print job from a remote workstation or computer attached to a printer in much the same way a print job can be manipulated at a printer LCD screen. Some of the options described in Wood are: “sides to be imaged, collate selections, paper supply options, image quality (darken-lighten) selections, reduction/enlargement selections, finisher selections, [and] quantity requested.” Column 3, lines 55 through 58. These are the types of options common to printer controls. Wood does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of independent claim 15 calling for “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” In contrast, Wood explains that “[t]o the operator at the remote terminal, the interface with the copier/printer . . . appears similar to that of an operator control/panel of a conventional copier/printer.” Column 6, lines 31 through 34.

Drawing FIG. 3 of the Applicant’s disclosure illustrates one embodiment of “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” “[S]elected features are compiled in a ‘selected feature window’ 114 as ‘selected labeled feature buttons’ 113 for incorporation into a user-configured and usable version of a

customized or customizable printer control panel 100.” Paragraph [0059]. “Selected labeled feature buttons 113 may also be arranged in location (e.g., by clicking and dragging) and manipulated in a desired presentation style.” Paragraph [0060]. “Additionally, related features can be ‘layered’ in a hierarchical and customized fashion.” Paragraph [0061]. By way of example only, selection of features to be included in a printer control panel may occur by “activation of on/off selectors (e.g., “checking” a box associated with a labeled feature button 112, “pressing” or “highlighting” a labeled feature button 112 to select or deselect a particular feature, “double-clicking” on a labeled feature button 112, etc.), selection of features and feature options from a drop-down menu or other menu type, and use of “click and drag” techniques.” Paragraph [0058].

Wood does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of independent claim 15 calling for “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” Roosen does not cure that deficiency. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of non-obviousness has not been established regarding the claimed invention of independent claim 15.

Regarding claim 21, claim 21 is directed to “[a] method of customizing a printer control panel, said method comprising: initiating a remote request by a web browser over a network for a web page from a web server incorporated in a printing device and linked to said network, said web page associated with at least one software application, said at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality for controlling operations of said printing device and at least one other network device; transmitting said web page over said network; downloading and displaying said web page using said web browser; downloading said at least one software application using said web browser in response to downloading said web page, and customizing said printer control panel using said at least one software application.”

In the Office Action claim 21 is rejected on the grounds “that claim 21 corresponds generally to independent claim 1 and recites similar features.” Office Action mailed April 4, 2005. The Applicant does not agree with that characterization. Claim 21 requires the claim limitation calling for “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality for controlling operations of said printing device and at least one other network device.” The Office Action further alleges that “Wood in view of Roosen discloses a plurality of network devices at least including one other printer.”

Wood does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of claim 21 calling for “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.”

Wood essentially teaches being able to customize a print job from a remote workstation or computer attached to a printer in much the same way a print job can be manipulated at a printer LCD screen. Some of the options described in Wood are: “sides to be imaged, collate selections, paper supply options, image quality (darken-lighten) selections, reduction/enlargement selections, finisher selections, [and] quantity requested.” Column 3, lines 55 through 58. These are the types of options common to printer controls. Wood does not teach or suggest “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” Wood explains that “[t]o the operator at the remote terminal, the interface with the copier/printer . . . appears similar to that of an operator control/panel of a conventional copier/printer.” Column 6, lines 31 through 34.

Drawing FIG. 3 of the Applicant’s disclosure illustrates one embodiment of the claim limitation of claim 21 calling for “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” “[S]elected features are compiled in a ‘selected feature window’ 114 as ‘selected labeled feature buttons’ 113 for incorporation into a user-configured and usable version of a customized or customizable printer control panel 100.” Paragraph [0059]. “Selected labeled feature buttons 113 may also be arranged in location (e.g., by clicking and dragging) and manipulated in a desired presentation style.” Paragraph [0060]. “Additionally, related features can be ‘layered’ in a hierarchical and customized fashion.” Paragraph [0061]. By way of example only, selection of features to be included in a printer control panel may occur by “activation of on/off selectors (e.g., ‘checking’ a box associated with a labeled feature button 112, ‘pressing’ or ‘highlighting’ a labeled feature button 112 to select or deselect a particular feature, ‘double-clicking’ on a labeled feature button 112, etc.), selection of features and feature options from a drop-down menu or other menu type, and use of ‘click and drag’ techniques.” Paragraph [0058].

Wood does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of claim 21 calling for “at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality.” Roosen does not cure that deficiency. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of non-obviousness has not been established under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention of claim 21.

Additionally, Wood in view of Roosen teaches away from at least one software application . . . for controlling operations of said printing device and at least one other network device.”

Wood discloses a remote workstation networked with multiple devices, (*see* FIG. 1) but does not disclose “at least one software application . . . for controlling operations of said printing device and at least one other network device.” Roosen teaches a printer control panel web page that provides an overview of available printers. *See* Paragraphs [0102] through [0105]. However, Roosen teaches that this is only possible when the web server is not incorporated in the printing device, but in a server. *See* paragraph [0111]. When the web server is incorporated into the printing device “[c]onsequently, the web server can only inform the browser of the status of its own printer and of print jobs residing in that printer.” Therefore, Roosen does not teach or suggest “at least one software application . . . for controlling operations of said printing device and at least one other network device.” Roosen specifically teaches away from that functionality. Any motivation to combine the references must have impermissibly been based upon the Applicant’s disclosure.

Claims 22 through 25 are allowable for at least the reason as depending from an allowable base claim.

Applicant requests entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The response is timely filed.

The response shows the application in condition for allowance.

The response does not require any further search or consideration.

Applicant submits that claims 1 through 15 and 21 through 25 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth herein.

Serial No. 09/928,577

Applicant requests the entry of this amendment, the allowance of claims 1 through 15 and 21 through 25, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: June 1, 2005  
JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw

---